
REMARKS

Applicant has filed amended claims 41-60 to better encompass the full scope and breadth of the invention notwithstanding Applicant's belief that the claims would have been allowable as originally filed. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that no claims have been narrowed within the meaning of *Festo*.

I. Pro Se Applicant Request For Constructive Assistance

If, for any reason the claims of this application are not believed to be in full condition for allowance, pro se applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner in drafting one or more acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP §707.07(j) in order that this application can be placed in allowable condition as soon as possible and without need for further proceedings.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-6, 9-13, 16-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Broadhurst

Claims 1-6, 9-13, 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Broadhurst (Reference A) U.S. Patent 6,560,634. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Examiner uses Reference A to show how Broadhurst teaches a method for determining the unavailability of a domain name across a plurality of domain levels within a global public internet domain name system (DNS). Examiner interprets each domain level as a different naming system. However, the DNS is a single naming system that is both a hierarchical and distributed naming system structured in the form of a plurality domain levels.

Applicant, as one's own lexicographer, *had already defined the DNS as a single naming system* and referenced Broadhurst in the Background of the Invention found on Page 10 lines 6-15, by stating "such techniques of finding similar identifiers are applied to the DNS only, which is a single naming system and does not consider multiple naming systems" in order to show limitations of prior art teachings. Furthermore aside from the Internet DNS, *Broadhurst does not teach, suggest, imply, nor make reference to any other naming system.*

Independent Claim 41

In light of this, all claims have been rewritten to define patentably over Broadhurst and other references, alone or in combination. For instance, the first recited step of independent Claim 41, "selecting at least two registerable naming systems from a group of registerable naming systems including a domain name system, a top level domain alias naming system, a multilingual naming system, a fictitious identifier naming system, a trademark naming system, a keyword naming system, a telephone number naming system, a username naming system, an account name naming system, a product code naming system, a book number naming system, a catalog identifier naming system, a document identifier naming system, an intellectual property identifier naming system, a manufacturer identifier naming system, a merchant/reseller/affiliate code naming system, an image naming system, a geographic naming system, a classification naming system, and a license plate identifier naming system", is in no way taught or suggested in Broadhurst and clearly distinguishes over prior art. (see page 33 line 6 - page 35 line 24 -- Note: page 35 lines 23-24 'any naming system that supports any listed identifier').

Furthermore, dependent Claims 42-56, inclusive, incorporate all the subject matter of Claim 41 and add additional subject matter, which makes them, a fortiori, independently patentable over Broadhurst and other references, alone or in combination.

Independent Claim 57 and Claim 60

Applicant further overcomes Broadhurst with respect to teaching how an identifier such as a domain name, for example, can be registered or determined available for registration in response to the initiation of request types other than that of a registration request. Before Applicant, all prior art shows that burden is on a user to access a registration service and initiate a registration request.

Applicant successfully argued over Broadhurst in related applications that are now U.S. patents 6,338,082 and 6,678,717 regarding the issue of performing identifier availability and registration in response to an unsuccessful resource location request. An IDS has been electronically filed July 22, 2004 via the ePave system citing Applicant's issued patents.

Claim 57 and Claim 60 take a similar approach by generating identifiers and determining identifier availability in response to a user logging in to an account (see Fig. 7a and 7b, page 30 lines 15-29) or in response to identifying a caller or a callee (see Fig. 8a, page 32 lines 15-28). For example, neither the second recited step of Claim 57, "generating one or more identifiers corresponding to at least one of a first identifier and account information in response to the user said logging in, said one or more

identifiers having a capability of being registered in one or more registerable naming systems", nor the second recited step of Claim 60, "generating one or more identifiers corresponding to at least one of a first identifier and account information in response to said identifying said one of a caller and callee, said one or more identifiers having a capability of being registered in one or more registerable naming systems" is even mentioned, taught, suggested, or implied in any way, shape, or form by Broadhurst.

III. Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Applicant has carefully reviewed the references cited but not applied. Applicant respectfully submits that none of those references, alone or in any combination, remedy the deficiencies of the applied art, nor teach or suggest the claimed invention alone or in any combination.

IV. Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, the present application and pending claims 41-60, as amended, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to issue a formal Notice of Allowance directed to claims 41-60, inclusive.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



July 22, 2004

Eric Schneider

pro se Applicant

13938A Cedar Road #258

University Heights, Ohio 44118

(216) 231-2400 - telephone